

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 404

TM 020 510

AUTHOR Fuentes, Edward J.; Stratoudakis, Carol Jay  
TITLE Public Response to the 1992 Goals Report. Outreach Report to the National Education Goals Panel.  
INSTITUTION National Education Goals Panel, Washington, DC.  
REPORT NO NEGP-93-02  
PUB DATE 3 Mar 93  
NOTE 32p.  
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Administrator Attitudes; Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Feedback; Information Dissemination; National Surveys; \*Parent Attitudes; Policy Formation; Public Opinion; Research Reports; \*Responses; \*Teacher Attitudes; \*User Needs (Information)

IDENTIFIERS Focus Groups Approach; \*National Education Goals Panel; \*Policymakers; Report Format

## ABSTRACT

This document summarizes the public response to the National Education Goals Panel's call for feedback on its work. Copies of the second annual "National Education Goals Report" had been sent to the Chief State School Officer in each state and territory. Twenty-seven of 55 chief officers replied to a request for their opinions of the report. The consensus was that the report content was useful and informative for those involved in improving education. However, the content was considered a bit dense for the average reader, and one respondent believed that the amount of data would overwhelm the layperson. Some respondents called for ranking or direct comparison of states. Most respondents thought that selections were clear and that graphs and summaries were easy to understand. Similar opinions were expressed by 22 representatives of education organizations and associations. The responses of members of 4 focus groups (total 39 participants) of education policymakers, parents, and teachers in West Virginia and Delaware indicate that the current structure of the report is less well-suited for teachers, school-level administrators, and parents than for policymakers. To better meet the needs of users, at least two versions of the report are required, one a reference text, and the other a more user-friendly version. Appendix A contains the survey response forms. Appendix B lists some responses to the report from the media. Appendix C contains acknowledgments. (SLD)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

TM

ED 361 404

---

## NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

# PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE 1992 GOALS REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

### Outreach Report to the National Education Goals Panel

Edward J. Fuentes  
Senior Research Associate

Carol Jay Stratoudakis, Ph.D.  
Staff Consultant

March 3, 1993

---

93-02

TM020510

## NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL MEMBERS

### GOVERNORS

E. Benjamin Nelson, Nebraska, Chair

Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., South Carolina (Chair 1991-1992)

Evan Bayh, Indiana

Terry Branstad, Iowa

Arne Carlson, Minnesota

John Engler, Michigan

John McKernan, Jr., Maine

Roy Romer, Colorado (Chair 1990-1991)

### MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Richard W. Riley, Secretary of Education

### MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

U.S. Senator Jeff Bingaman, New Mexico

U.S. Senator Thad Cochran, Mississippi

U.S. Representative Dale Kildee, Michigan

U.S. Representative William Goodling, Pennsylvania

Public Response to the 1992 Goals Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                           |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction .....                                        | 1  |
| Targeted Outreach .....                                   | 2  |
| • Chief State School Officers .....                       | 2  |
| • Associations and Organizations .....                    | 4  |
| • Focus Groups .....                                      | 6  |
| • Individual Respondents .....                            | 7  |
| Conclusions .....                                         | 8  |
| Appendix A: Response Forms .....                          | 9  |
| Appendix B: Press Response to the 1992 Goals Report ..... | 15 |
| Appendix C: Acknowledgments .....                         | 23 |

PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE  
1992 NATIONAL GOALS REPORT:  
BUILDING A NATION OF LEARNERS

## INTRODUCTION

The second annual *National Education Goals Report* was issued on September 30, 1992. Like the 1991 Report, it is an account of the nation's progress toward the National Goals. Unlike its predecessor, however, the Report benefitted from reader feedback on the 1991 Report (Fuentes & Stratoudakis, 1992). Based on this input, many reader suggestions were incorporated into the 1992 Report. The objective was to produce a document that was clearly written, factually accurate, attractively designed, and appealing to a broad audience. These qualities continued to be of paramount importance even as the Report grew from 246 pages to 336 as another data year was added and new data became available.

Beginning on September 30, boxes of Reports were sent to Governors and State Departments of Education as well as educational organizations and associations. Moreover, copies were distributed upon direct request through the Panel offices. Thus far, over 24,000 copies of the *1992 National Education Goals Report* have been disseminated.

Like last year, reader feedback on the 1992 Report was sought. During the first week of November, letters soliciting feedback were sent to the 55 Chief State School Officers (this includes territories, commonwealths, and the District of Columbia) and nearly 100 selected education organizations. The Chiefs and organization leaders were asked to record their opinions on a Response Form (see Appendix A) enclosed in their letter. A month after this initial mail out, follow-up telephone calls were made to every Chief and organization leader who had failed to respond. These individuals were urged to complete and send in their Response Form. In cases in which an individual had misplaced the Response Form, a duplicate copy was forwarded immediately.

Other individuals who received a 1992 Report responded on a form included on the last two pages of the document (see Appendix A). This form sought information from individuals who either requested copies directly from the Panel office or obtained one through their state, school, or professional organization or in some other manner.

Finally, four focus groups were conducted in two states in mid-December. The groups were made up of parents, teachers, and policymakers. These individuals were asked to

review the 1992 Report and its executive summary and to express their opinions in an open forum. Their responses were recorded and summarized by Panel staff.

This document summarizes the public response to the Panel's call for feedback on its work. The result of this effort will be used by Goals Panel staff to improve future Reports to meet better the educational information needs of the nation. We also include a summary of press coverage of the release of the 1992 Goals Report (see Appendix B).

## TARGETED OUTREACH

### Chief State School Officers

Copies of the Report were sent to the Chief State School Officer in each state, commonwealth and territory. Out of a total of 55 Chiefs, 27 replied to a request for their opinions. Each Chief was provided a Response Form (see Appendix A) that invited comments on the Report's content, format/design, text, and data. Respondents were also encouraged to provide any other comments they felt were appropriate or helpful. All respondents were asked to take special note of the Report's usefulness and readability for a wide range of audiences.

### *Content*

The consensus was that the content was useful and informative for those involved in improving education. The Report has been used, for example, by the states in their own reports. The first and last chapters were especially appreciated. All-in-all, the Chiefs considered the 1992 Report a handy reference for tracking the Goals.

On the negative side, the content was considered a bit dense for the average reader. One respondent believed that the amount of data contained in the Report would "overwhelm" the lay person. Interestingly, some of the respondents called for the ranking or direct comparison of states on the reported data.

### *Format/Design*

On the whole, for their own use, the respondents thought the sections of the Report were clear. The graphs were understandable and the summary statements that accompanied them were especially helpful. The two page state format was especially convenient for reviewing state progress toward the Goals.

When considering the usability of the Report for the average reader, however, the respondents were less kind. Again, the sheer volume of information was considered daunting. There were other comments dealing with the look of the Report: the print size in the state pages was too small; the green and red type and graphs were too hard to read; the scales used on the graphs were too tight to read data trends; and, the footnotes were not referenced clearly enough. Finally, there were those who called for a format that directly allowed for state-by-state comparisons.

### *Text*

Here, there was less consensus on the readability of the text than there had been on the appropriateness of the content or the appeal of the Report format. In general, the respondents believed that, for them, the text was readable and the references to charts and graphs provided further clarity.

On the other hand, if the "average reader" was taken to be a lay person, then the text was considered "intimidating" and "laborious" and of "little interest." The Panel was admonished to make a better effort to keep the technical jargon to a minimum.

### *Data*

There was not much overall criticism of the manner in which the data were reported. There were, however, numerous specific comments, for example:

- not enough space was devoted to the state section;
- item 3 under Goal 1 was unclear;
- the SASS sample sizes are insufficient for state-by-state indicators; and,
- some explanation must be given why a given state data element is missing.

Although most of these and other criticisms may be corrected through judicious editing, there was one general weakness mentioned that is not as easily remedied. Many of the respondents believe that there were not enough direct measures of outcomes. This was expressed in a number of ways, but the message was always the same: the Report sorely lacks direct measures of the stated goals.

### *Other*

While some of these comments result from the keen editorial skills of the respondents (e.g., footnotes 1–6 on pages 144–255 need to be referenced to pages 293–294), most were suggestions for improving the usefulness of the Report. These suggestions were:

- include a prologue describing the Goals Panel's charge; the Panel's administrative and management structure (including advisory groups) and its budget;
- include an appendix of the names, addresses, and positions of key staff and committee chairs;
- include an appendix of key meetings, their dates and locations;
- include a summary of each state's Goal-related actions for the reporting year;
- include a chapter on the state role: how the state might improve data quality and actions that states might take to support the initiatives of the Goals Panel;
- include an executive summary in the *body* of the Report; and,
- include a section on *how* to address problem areas.

### Associations and Organizations

Copies of the Report were sent to 97 representatives of education organizations and associations. These representatives were provided the same form sent to the Chief State School Officers (see Appendix A). Of these 97 organizations and associations, 22 forwarded written comments to Goals Panel staff (see Appendix C).

### *Content*

The respondents found the content to be informative, comprehensive, and useful. In their opinion, the Report provided a good mix of text and charts. They believed that the Report focuses national attention on the nation's progress toward the National Education Goals.

The weaknesses identified by the respondents were fairly specific. One person stated that the Report should have made mention of the ongoing geography assessment and future availability of the data while another felt that Goal 5 should have been given more attention.

*Format/Design*

The format was characterized as "excellent" by this group. It was deemed both understandable and helpful for practitioners. It was easy to follow with self-explanatory, simple graphs.

If there was a weakness, some respondents thought it was the overabundance of information. Others, however, believed that graphs should have been added to the state section as well. This would more clearly link state and national data.

*Text*

Like their state counterparts, the organization and association representatives also were in disagreement on this factor. Some stated that the text was clear, concise, consistent, understandable and generally appropriate for the "average" reader. Others, while acknowledging the quality, found the Report's text ill-suited for the lay person's thinking. The average reader would probably be overwhelmed by the technical jargon and find the number of charts daunting.

Other critiques were more specific. One person called for more prominence of text and footnotes that qualify the reported findings; another wished for bigger type in the executive summary.

*Data*

The comments here can be characterized as praise for data clarity as presented in well-explained charts and graphs.

*Other*

The few comments under this category ranged from suggestions specific to a Goal or the format, to calls for changes that would alter the tenor of the document.

The specific suggestions were:

- increase the emphasis on higher education; and
- add minority group data to every graph.

The general comments were:

- increase minority involvement in Goals Panel activities, from minority representation on the Panel to soliciting minority feedback on Panel initiatives; and
- draw conclusions. That is, the Report should discuss the implications of the data for America's children. In short, some analysis and interpretation is required beyond reporting data without comment.

### Focus Groups

The National Education Goals Panel conducted four focus groups in mid-December involving 39 education policymakers, parents, and teachers in West Virginia and Delaware. The purpose of the groups was to learn more from key education stakeholders about how best to convey the message of the National Education Goals Panel, and how to increase understanding and support of the National Education Goals and standards-setting efforts. As part of the focus groups' task, they reviewed the 1992 Report and its executive summary. They were asked specifically about the Report's style, readability, and usefulness. These participants' remarks were collected and compiled in a report, portions of which are summarized below.

Policymakers, in particular, responded positively. They thought the documents were concise, well organized around the Goals, put key information up front, and attractively printed and designed. They also said that the documents would be far more useful for school board members, administrators, teachers and state officials than for parents.

Teachers said that they sensed the documents were not written either by teachers or with teachers in mind. They said the documents added to their feelings that they are outside the Goals process.

Parents echoed the concern of teachers who felt the Goals documents were not written for them. West Virginia parents stated that they needed baseline data to chart a course and check progress, but they thought that the material in the Report would not be understandable to the average parent. These parents believed that it would be more useful to reach parents through a one-page flyer, a face-to-face meeting explaining the Goals, or a newsletter, rather than a full-blown Report or its executive summary.

Delaware parents said the Report's strength was twofold: it presented national information they otherwise would not see and it kept important educational issues in the

forefront. They appreciated knowing that they have the same information that parents in California and Texas have about the nation's schools. Equally important, the Report gives parents greater leverage in challenging "business as usual" in the school.

### **Individual Respondents**

As stated, thousands of copies of the 1992 Report have been disseminated to education organizations, associations, state and local governments, etc., and to individuals who directly contact the Panel offices. Many of the copies undoubtedly find their way into the hands of educators, parents, and other interested citizens. The number of Reports going to individuals in this manner, while unknown, must be sizable since approximately 24,000 copies have been forwarded to various state and local governments, education associations and organizations, and other entities. To date, about 1,200 copies have been disseminated through Panel offices by direct request.

Each copy of the 1992 Report contains a public response form (see Appendix A) on its back page. It is this form that individuals are requested to fill out and forward to Goals Panel staff. Given the thousands of copies that have been distributed to individuals, it is disconcerting to report that only 25 have responded. This number is such a small fraction of the total dissemination effort that it has no value in gauging readers' opinion. However, it says something about the need to revamp the Panel's efforts to collect feedback from its audience.

The Panel staff is currently reviewing the following options to secure more direct citizen feedback in the future:

- 1) Displaying the Response Form more prominently and perforating it along its edge to allow ready separation from the Report.
- 2) Designing the Response Form so that as it is folded it becomes its own self-addressed, franked envelope. Or alternatively, using a simple franked postcard.
- 3) Informing anyone who requests a Report that, in exchange for a free copy, they agree to fill out and send in the Response Form. This commitment may be reiterated by enclosing a written reminder with every Report copy. This, of course, is not binding, but people generally honor their commitments and this procedure will highlight the importance of receiving their opinions.
- 4) Reworking the Response Form content so that it fits on a single page (or postcard), is clearly stated, and easily responded to.

- 5) Sending reminder letters to a sample of nonrespondents.
- 6) Telephoning a sample of respondents to gather more in-depth opinions.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the reported public response, the Goals Report seems well-suited for policymakers at the state and national levels and for those in policymaking positions within educational associations and organizations. It is a valuable reference for these groups. However, its current structure appears much less well-suited for teachers, school-level administrators, and, especially, parents. There were too many graphs and the two-part format was confusing. The consensus is that there is too much information for the "average" person to absorb, some of it of little apparent relevance.

What this means in practical terms was best expressed by one of the respondents: the Panel must produce a document that "reaches conclusions." Simply put, what do the data mean for school administrators, teachers, and parents? What should they be looking for in their own policies, attitudes, behavior, and the behavior and attitudes of their students and children that will enhance progress toward the National Education Goals? In short, make the findings as meaningful for individuals as it is for the nation.

No single document can be all things to all people. Therefore, to better meet the needs of general audiences, at least two versions of the *National Education Goals Report* are required. One document, similar to what is currently produced, would serve primarily as a "reference" text to education policymakers. This report's narrative would be minimal with a first chapter perhaps devoted to an executive summary. Another more narrative, "user-friendly," substantially shorter document could be written for school personnel and parents, and other designated audiences. It would highlight key relevant findings across the Goals and their importance and implications for future behavior.

**APPENDIX A****Response Forms**

1. Response Form for Chief State School Officers and Education Organizations / Associations
2. Response Form for the General Public

---

**NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL  
FEEDBACK FORM  
1992 NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS REPORT**

PLEASE FAX TO LAURA LANCASTER, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,  
NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL AT (202) 632-0957

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

STATE \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE \_\_\_\_\_ FAX \_\_\_\_\_

- 1) CONTENT  
Is the content of the report informative? useful?
  
- 2) FORMAT/DESIGN  
Was it clear? Were the different sections divided in a clear way?  
Were the graphs understandable?
  
- 3) TEXT  
Was the text "readable" to the average reader? Was it consistent, concise?
  
- 4) DATA -- (Please keep in mind state data reported in the Goals Report was limited to what the Panel considered quality data on a state-by-state comparable basis.)  
Were the data reported in a clear way? Any changes to the way the data were presented?
  
- 5) OTHER  
Does your department have other comments or suggestions on the Goals Report or on communication between the states and the Panel?

## PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE 1992 GOALS REPORT

As part of our continuing effort to maximize the effectiveness of the annual progress report in communicating information about our educational performance to all Americans, your comments are requested. We welcome your observations, suggestions, and responses to the following questions.

1. READABILITY: Is the report written in a way that you can easily read and understand?  
Please circle your choice on a scale from 1 to 5.

|              |   |                   |   |               |
|--------------|---|-------------------|---|---------------|
| Not Readable |   | Somewhat Readable |   | Very Readable |
| 1            | 2 | 3                 | 4 | 5             |

2. INTEREST: Please check the part(s) of the report that are of primary interest to you.

- ☐ Introductions
- ☐ Chapter 1: U.S. Performance in An International Context
- ☐ Chapter 2, Part I: Goal Indicators
- ☐ Chapter 2, Part II: Additional Information Related to the Goals
- ☐ Chapter 2, Part III: State Indicators on the Goals and Objectives
- ☐ Chapter 3: Progress Summary on Future Indicators
- ☐ Chapter 4: The Federal Role in Meeting the Goals
- ☐ Information about a Goal(s); please circle: 1 2 3 4 5 6
- ☐ Appendices
- ☐ Other; please identify:

3. USEFULNESS: How helpful is the report to you? Please circle your choice on a scale of 1 to 5.

|             |   |                  |   |              |
|-------------|---|------------------|---|--------------|
| Not Helpful |   | Somewhat Helpful |   | Very Helpful |
| 1           | 2 | 3                | 4 | 5            |

4. PURPOSE: Please check the primary purpose(s) the report can serve for you.

- ☐ find out the past year's progress toward achieving the Goals
- ☐ answer a question about progress in a particular Goal area
- ☐ look up information about a state
- ☐ obtain data to support implementation of a reform effort
- ☐ as a guide to determine what new measures and data are needed to track progress toward the Goals
- ☐ as a reference to help develop a state- or local-level "Report Card" to measure progress
- ☐ as a reference to help develop high standards and assessment systems
- ☐ other; please identify:

5. ATTENTION: Please identify any particular data in the report that captured your attention.

|      |       |               |       |
|------|-------|---------------|-------|
| page | _____ | exhibit title | _____ |
| page | _____ | exhibit title | _____ |
| page | _____ | exhibit title | _____ |
| page | _____ | exhibit title | _____ |

---

PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE 1992 GOALS REPORT

## COMMENTS

Your reactions to the 1992 Goals Report and insights into how we can improve future reports are requested on this form. Please consider commenting on such issues as the organization of the document, the clarity of the data reported, and the value of the information to students, parents, teachers, policymakers, and others concerned about our progress toward the National Education Goals. Use additional sheets, if necessary.

Thank you for your comments.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle one:

STUDENT / PARENT / EDUCATOR / PUBLIC OFFICIAL / BUSINESS OR COMMUNITY LEADER  
POLICYMAKER / CONCERNED CITIZEN

Please return to: National Education Goals Panel, 1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 270, Washington, D.C. 20036.  
Attention: Laura Lancaster, Public Information Officer, fax (202) 632-0957.

---

---

National Education Goals Panel, 93-02

**APPENDIX B****Press Response to The 1992 Goals Report**

"COMPLACENCY REIGNS"

"COMPLACENCY BLAMED FOR EDUCATIONAL LAG"

"AMERICANS TOO COMPLACENT ABOUT SCHOOLS"

"COMPLACENCY SLOWS ACADEMIC PROGRESS"

These article titles accompanied the 1992 Report's release and successfully captured one of its primary messages – "We are too complacent about our educational shortcomings." Articles noted slow progress and described public tolerance toward academic mediocrity. Overall, the press conveyed a sense of inertia and discouragement. Behind the headlines was the message that our current status is due to lack of effort, not lack of ability. Low expectations were cited repeatedly as a central cause of the nation's poor student performance.

The following is a list of the newspaper articles and newswire items that followed the Report release. Press coverage of the 1992 Report was down from that experienced with the 1991 Report release, 50 articles for 1992 versus 65 articles for 1991.

**Akron Beacon Journal – October 1, 1992**

LITTLE PROGRESS MADE BETWEEN GRADES 8 AND 10, NATIONAL GOALS REPORT SAYS PANEL CHAIRMAN WARNS AGAINST BEING SATISFIED WITH MEDIOCRE RESULTS

By: Associated Press

**Associated Press – September 30, 1992**

STUDY SHOWS ONLY MODEST ACADEMIC GAINS BETWEEN GRADES 8 – 10

By: Tamara Henry

**Atlanta Constitution – October 1, 1992**

AMERICANS TOO 'COMPLACENT' ABOUT SCHOOLS, REPORT SAYS

By: Betsy White

**Atlanta Journal – September 30, 1992**

NATIONAL GOALS STILL NOT MET, REPORT CARD ON SCHOOLS SAYS PARENTS CALLED 'CONTENT WITH MEDIOCRITY'

By: Betsy White

**Atlanta Journal Constitution – October 4, 1992**

PARENTS DENY COMPLACENCY ALLEGED IN EDUCATION REPORT

By: Laura Wisniewski

---

**Baltimore Morning Sun - October 1, 1992**

**PROGRESS OF U.S. STUDENTS 'DISCOURAGING,' PANEL SAYS EDUCATION  
SUMMIT SET GOALS IN '89**

By: Newswire

**Central News Agency - October 1, 1992**

**AMERICAN EDUCATION STILL BEHIND**

**Chicago Tribune - October 1, 1992**

**COMPLACENCY BLAMED FOR EDUCATIONAL LAG**

By: Chicago Tribune Wires

**Christian Science Monitor - October 1, 1992**

**REPORT CARD SHOWS U.S. SCHOOLS LAGGING**

By: Laurel Shaper Walters

**Columbus Dispatch - October 1, 1992**

**PROGRESS LACKING IN REPORT CARD ON EDUCATION**

By: George Embrey

**Daily News of Los Angeles - October 1, 1992**

**U.S. MAKES SLOW PROGRESS TOWARD EDUCATIONAL GOALS**

By: Karen Dewitt, The New York Times

**Daily Report Card - October 1, 1992**

**NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL REPORT: COMPLACENCY REIGNS**

By: Staff

**Education Reports - October 5, 1992**

**GOALS PANEL RELEASES SECOND ANNUAL REPORT**

By: Staff

**Education Week - October 7, 1992**

**PANEL FINDS 'MODEST PROGRESS' TOWARD NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS**

By: Robert Rothman

**Fort Worth Star --Telegram**

**EDUCATION PANEL FINDS TOO MUCH APATHY**

By: Staff

---

**Gannett News Service – September 30, 1992**

**DANGEROUS SCHOOLS, UNPREPARED STUDENTS STALL EDUCATION PROGRESS**

By: Lacrishia Butler

**Governors' Bulletin – October 12, 1992**

**INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS POINT TO NEED FOR REFORM**

By: Staff

**Houston Post – October 1, 1992**

**UNPREPARED KIDS, VIOLENCE SABOTAGE SCHOOLS' PROGRESS; REPORT  
PAINTS BLEAK FUTURE FOR EDUCATION**

By: Lacrishia Butler

**Lexington Herald-Leader – October 1, 1992**

**SLIGHT PROGRESS FOUND ON EDUCATION GOALS**

By: Staff

**National Journal – October 10, 1992**

**GOALPOSTS**

By: Staff

**New Orleans Times Picayune – October 1, 1992**

**EDUCATION GOALS NOT BEING REACHED**

By: Associated Press

**NSPRA Fax News Service – September 30, 1992**

**INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT GAP WIDENS**

By: Staff

**Newsday – October 1, 1992**

**TEEN STUDENTS AT RISK; THREATS, THEFT JEOPARDIZE PROGRESS, REPORT  
SAYS**

By: John Hildebrand

**Oregonian – October 1, 1992**

**EDUCATION PANEL REPORTS 'DISCOURAGING' FINDINGS**

By: Alan K. Ota

**Orlando Sentinel – October 1, 1992**

**REPORT CARD ON SCHOOLS READS 'LITTLE PROGRESS'**

By: Cox News Service

---

**Orlando Sentinel - October 28, 1992**

**BOOK HELPS KIDS COPE WITH VIOLENCE**

By: Susan Jacobson

**Palm Beach Post - October 1, 1992**

**U.S. LAGGING ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS, PANEL SAYS**

By: Betsy White

**Philadelphia Inquirer - October 1, 1992**

**OFFICIALS: N.J. MISSES MARK IN EDUCATION; VIOLENCE AND DROPOUT RATE ARE BLAMED. BOTH INCREASED DURING THE 1991-92 SCHOOL YEAR**

By: Charles Hutzler

**Philadelphia Inquirer - October 1, 1992**

**ON EDUCATION GOALS, THE PROGRESS IS SLOW; SOME OF THE FINDINGS WERE "QUITE DISCOURAGING." THE GOALS WERE SET THREE YEARS AGO.**

By: Inquirer Wire Service

**Plain Dealer - October 1, 1992**

**PARENTS CALLED SATISFIED WITH MEDIOCRE SCHOOLS**

By: Cox News Service

**Portland Press Harold - October 2, 1992**

**PROGRESS REPORT CITES MAINE EFFORT TOWARD NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS**

By: Michael Norton

**PR Newswire Association, Inc. - September 30, 1992**

**EDUCATION GOALS PANEL ISSUES SECOND ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT; ENCOURAGES GREATER EXPECTATIONS FROM AMERICA**

By: Staff

**PR Newswire Association, Inc. - September 30, 1992**

**NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL CHALLENGE REQUIRES FEDERAL ACTION NOW, SAYS COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS**

By: Staff

**PR Newswire in Washington - September 30, 1992**

**NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION CHARGES ADMINISTRATION WITH JEOPARDIZING NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS**

By: Staff

**Reuters, Limited - September 30, 1992**

**LACK OF MOTIVATION SEEN HOLDING BACK AMERICAN STUDENTS**

By: Jacqueline Frank

**Rocky Mountain News - October 1, 1992**

**GROUP GIVES AMERICAN SCHOOLS MIXED REPORT CARD; U.S. MAKING  
PROGRESS, BUT MEDIOCRITY ACCEPTED**

By: Kenneth Eskey

**Rocky Mountain News - October 13, 1992**

**FAILED SYSTEM CAN'T CURE ITSELF**

By: Phillip Burgess

**St. Paul Pioneer Press - October 1, 1992**

**STUDENTS INCHING TOWARD GOAL**

By: Staff

**San Francisco Chronicle - September 30, 1992**

**SCHOOLS STILL DON'T MEET GOALS, STUDY SAYS CITING POOR MASTERY OF  
MATH AND SCIENCE; PANEL CALLS FOR NATIONAL TESTING, STANDARDS**

By: Staff

**San Jose Mercury News - September 30, 1992**

**SCHOOL SCORES SHOW LITTLE IMPROVEMENT**

By: Associated Press

**San Jose Mercury News - October 1, 1992**

**PANEL ON EDUCATION REPORTS MODEST GAINS**

By: Staff

**School Board News - August 18, 1992**

**GOVERNORS CONTINUE TO PUSH FOR EDUCATION REFORM IN FACE  
OF RISING VOTER OPPOSITION**

By: Staff

**School Board News - October 13, 1992**

**SLOW PROGRESS FOUND IN 1992 GOALS REPORT**

By: Staff

**Seattle Times - September 30, 1992**

**STUDENTS STILL LAG IN THREE MAJOR AREAS, EDUCATION GOALS PANEL  
STUDY REPORTS**

By: Associated Press

**Sun Sentinel - October 1, 1992**

**STUDENTS PROGRESS SLOWLY; REPORT INDICATES MODEST HEADWAY**

By: Associated Press

**Times Union - October 1, 1992**

**PUPILS LAG IN REACHING EDUCATION GOALS**

By: Associated Press

**United Press International - September 29, 1992**

**PROGRESS SLOW IN PA EDUCATION GOALS**

By: Staff

**USA Today - October 1, 1992**

**COMPLACENCY SLOWS ACADEMIC PROGRESS**

By: Dennis Kelly

**The Washington Post - October 12, 1992**

**THE 91 PERCENT SOLUTION**

By: Editorial

**The Washington Times - October 1, 1992**

**SCHOOLS RESIST MAJOR REFORMS, PANELISTS SAY**

By: Carol Innerst

**APPENDIX C**  
**Acknowledgments**

---

The Goals Panel wishes to thank the following individuals and organizations for their comments on the *1992 National Education Goals Report*.

#### STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Alabama Department of Education  
*Robert E. Lockwood*

Alaska Department of Education  
*Mark Kissel*

Arkansas Department of Education  
*James Boardman*

California Department of Education  
*Bill Honig*

Connecticut Department of Education  
*Emily Melendez*

Florida Department of Education  
*Betty Castor*

Georgia Department of Education  
*Edith Belden*  
*Werner Rogers*

Hawaii Department of Education  
*Charles T. Toguchi*

Idaho Department of Education  
*Jerry L. Evans*  
*Sally Tiel*

Illinois Department of Education  
*Connie Wise*

Indiana Department of Education  
*H. Dean Evans*

---

Kansas Department of Education  
*Ann Harrison*

Kentucky Department of Education  
*Doris Davis Goldstein*

Louisiana Department of Education  
*Jeanne M. Burns*

Maryland Department of Education  
*Nancy S. Grasmick*

Missouri Department of Education  
*Robert E. Bartman*

New Jersey Department of Education  
*John Ellis*

New York Department of Education  
*Thomas Sobol*

Ohio Department of Education  
*Mara Matteson*

Oklahoma Department of Education  
*Mike Brare*

Pennsylvania Department of Education  
*Donald B. Spangler*

South Carolina Department of Education  
*Barbara S. Nielsen*

South Dakota Department of Education  
*Karon L. Schaack*

Texas Department of Education  
*Julian Shaddix*

Utah Department of Education  
*David E. Nelson*

West Virginia Department of Education  
*James F. Snyder*

Wyoming Department of Education  
*Scott C. Farris*

---

## ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

American Association for Adult and Community Education  
*Drew Allbritten*

The ASPIRA Association, Inc.  
*Kim C. King*

Association for Childhood Education International  
*Charles M. Godwin*  
*Gerald C. Odland*

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development  
*Gene Carter*  
*Brian Curry*

The Business Round Table  
*Christopher T. Cross*

Council for Advancement and Support of Education  
*Peter Buchanan*

Council of Independent Colleges  
*Allen P. Splete*

Education Commission of the States  
*Melodye Bush*

National Advisory Council on Indian Education  
*John Cheek*

National Association for the Education of Young Children  
*Sue Bredekamp*

National Association of Elementary School Principals  
*Edward O. Keller*

National Association of Independent Colleges  
and Universities

*Michael G. Morrison*

*Richard F. Rosser*

*John W. White, Jr.*

National Black Child Development Institute, Inc.

*Evelyn K. Moore*

National Community Education Association

*Starla Jewell-Kelly*

National Council of Educational Opportunities Associations

*Arnold L. Mitchem*

National Education Association

*Debra DeLee*

National Geographic Society

*Robert E. Dulli*

National Head Start Association

*Sarah Greene*

National School Public Relations Association

*Rich Bagin*

Quality Education for Minorities (QEM) Network

*Mary Futrell*

SER-JOBS For Progress National, Inc.

*Pedro L. Viera*

U.S. Catholic Conference

*Lourdes Sheehan*

---

**INDIVIDUALS**

***Marcus Ballenger***  
Wichita State University

***Linda Beckum***  
Lanett, Alabama

***Ernest L. Boyer (Convener, Goal 1 Resource Group)***  
The Carnegie Foundation for the  
Advancement of Teaching

***R.M. Carter***  
Southern Illinois University

***Michael Christakos***  
Oak Forest, Illinois

***Cecelia T. Coleman***  
South Hill, Virginia

***Cox R. Crider***  
Mexia, Texas

***Leroy Derstine***  
Bradford High School, Pennsylvania

***Barbara F. Domba***  
Hempfield Area School District, Pennsylvania

***Michael P. Forsythe***  
Jeanerette, Louisiana

***Marv Fralish***  
DeKalb County School System, Georgia

***Camille Hodges***  
Fairfax Station, Virginia

***Min Kim***  
Orinda, California

**Mark Musick (Convener, Goal 5 Resource Group)**  
Southern Regional Education Board

**Richard F. Osner**  
DOD Dependent Schools, Japan

**Daniel W. Proctor**  
Richmond, Virginia

**John W. Porter (Convener, Goal 6 Resource Group)**  
Urban Education Alliance

**Lauren Resnick (Convener, Goal 3 Resource Group)**  
University of Pittsburgh

**Mary Sturdivant**  
Conyers Middle School, Georgia

**Alvin W. Trivelpiece (Convener, Goal 4 Resource Group)**  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory

**Rafael Valdivieso (Convener, Goal 2 Resource Group)**  
Academy for Educational Development

**Brian Waicker**  
University of Durban, South Africa

**Michael G. Watt**  
Tasmania, Australia

**Leonard Watts**  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

**Angie Willingham**  
Donna, Texas

# NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Wilmer S. Cody

## ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

Martin E. Orland

## STAFF

Tia Cosey, Receptionist  
Nancy Delasos, Staff Consultant  
Cindy Dixon, Program Assistant  
Edward Fuentes, Senior Education Associate  
Laura Lancaster, Public Information Officer  
Leslie Lawrence, Education Associate  
Cynthia Prince, Senior Education Associate  
Carol Jay Stratoudakis, Staff Consultant  
Andrea Venezia, Staff Consultant  
Charles J. Walter, Executive Officer  
Emily Wurtz, Senior Education Associate